April 20, 2015

Clerk of the U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California 280 South 1st Street San Jose, CA 95113

Re: Richard Noll and Rhythm Motor Sports, LLC v. eBay Inc. Case No. 5:11-cv-04585 Objection to the Settlement



Dear Clerk of the Court:

This letter is an objection to the proposed Class Action Settlements and request for attorney's fees. I am a class member who is not being represented by counsel, and I do not intend to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

I adopt and incorporate the objections of other class members. In addition, the basis of my objection are four fold: 1) There is no adequate showing that the proposed Settlement bears any relationship to the alleged damages inflicted by Defendant on Plaintiffs; 2) The actions of Class Counsel, including improper request for a protective order and/or confidentiality agreement, may be indicia of a consciousness of unfairness and collusion; and violates class member's Constitutional right to Due Process; 3) The amount of the proposed attorney fees plus expenses constitute over reaching and represents unjust enrichment; and 4) The Settlements does not protect the interests of sub-classes members who may have other, unrelated claims against defendants such as those arising from tort.

In its Settlement Statement published on the case web site, Class Counsel failed to recite what particular discovery results, what particular proceedings, and what particular procedures led up to the proposed Settlement. Members of the class, including myself, need to be able to look through the file, including discovery, and satisfy themselves that the proposed Settlement is adequate, fair, and an arms length transaction, but this is not possible because there is a protective order in place. Instead, we are offered only empty recitations naming types of discovery that could have been copied from a law school hornbook, and the examples of discovery that are set forth raise red flags about unnecessary and unproductive procedures. If the role of an objector is to have any meaning, it must be coupled with the right to scrutinize the case file and verify the details. Failure to allow this access, coupled with Court approval, constitutes a denial of My right to due process under the 5th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution

##MASS CHADAMASS CONTRACTOR

in be with an augment, my right to access and construct a class Contract in the intersection of the said and a construct of Professional Conduct, there is the the Adentes of Kalendesconness in the last of Education of Contract of Cont

Former of the ST ST ST THE THE

the control of the co

राज अर्थ्वरक्षीरको तुम कर्क्यान्ते, जा वार्ण क्षेत्र परित्य हाई। हो जाना भारता । तुम्कीन करान पुरित्वे हिप्पिकारकार

and the state of the control of the

and the state of the second state of the sta

িটো ইয়েক্ট্রেন্স ৮ ব্রুচ্চ হার্টাচেক্ট্রেন্স ব্রুচ্চ চার্টাল

The state of the s

verword at same mice about 13 to their in easy from were mades completely only the same series of the action of the Circumstance of the control of the bear of the control of the control

าร์ พระยังเขาหน่าสมมาณที่ เรียบทรู โดก (ค.ศ. โดยเกม พระพระทาง), ค.ศ. เกม เกม เลย เลย สมพัฒนา (ค.ศ. 2014) ที่ โ

Since I am a member of the class, and therefore a client of Class Counsel, there is legal authority to support my right to access and scrutinize Class Counsel's file. Beside the Rules of Professional Conduct, there is *In the Matter of Kaleidoscope, Inc.* 15 B.R. 232 (Bkrutcy. D.Ga. 1981) where the court held that the attorney is an agent of the client and may not refuse to turn over any portion of client's file, and may not assert work-product privilege against client. And in *Resolution Trust Corp. v. H---, P.C.* 128 F.R.D. 647 (N.D. Tex. 1989), the court concluded that the entire contents of a client's file belong to the client, and that neither the attorney-client privilege nor work-product doctrines were applicable.

The protective order and/or confidentiality agreement in place was the result of a joint collaboration between Class Counsel and the Defense, and it raises the specter of collusion. Under Rule 26©, a district court may issue a protective order overruling the public's right to access the fruits of pretrial discovery for *good cause*. For good cause to exist under Rule 26©, "the party seeking protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted." *Phillips v. G.M. Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002). Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples or articulated reasoning, do not satisfy the Rule 26(c test." *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). Rather, the party seeking protection must make a "particularized showing of good cause with respect to [each] individual document." *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. District Court—N.Dist.* (*San Jose*) 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999). Class Counsel and the Defense obtained a protective order, but they avoided the Court's scrutiny that may have benefited members of the class.

Here, no particularized showing of good cause with respect to each individual document was presented, and as a class member with the right to object to any settlement, my right to access to discovery is far greater than merely a right afforded to a member of the general public.

Additionally, under the cloak of a protective order and/or confidentiality agreement, Class Counsel may have seen no need to engage in real discovery to determine what the case was worth. Instead, they were free to discuss attorney fees without the bother of having to be adversaries on behalf of the Class. Once they discovered what attorney fees were acceptable to the defense, they may have seen no need to discover more.

Rule 23 sets no particular standards for objectors, but it sets high standards, including high ethical standards, for class counsel in class action cases such as this. In *Eubank v. Pella Corp.* (a case decided June 2, 2014) Nos. 13-2091, 13-2133, 13-2136, 13-2162, 13-2202, the Seventh Circuit removed Class Counsel for "demonstrated" lack of integrity in another matter completely independent of the instant case before the Court. And in *Creative Montessori Learning Centers v. Ashford Gear LLC*, 662 F.3rd 913, 918 (7th Cir. 2011) the Court ruled that only slight misconduct by Class Counsel was grounds for removal.

Therefore, I oppose the proposed settlement and demand greater information on how it

Case5:11-cv-04585-EJD Document138 Filed04/24/15 Page4 of 5

on defined therete with the feet of the test of the continues and another become in a family And Fire which the fact them is a negative transpose of the ordinary relies and indilene car tradescale licevery wan adoptate. Take operate the amount of the expense from conformed as being the grade abbaseous states and some design for and and asserting a second of the properties To a confidence เลือน โดย ต้อง เดือน (Confidence เลือน เมื่อเลือน เลือน เลือน เลือน เลือน เลือน เลือน เลือน เล ting til til til er eftill i de skinge og kollerengeret i det eller et en eller er et til

and the first of the case was a first first of the case of the cas

and Grand Albertanick Color Color (1980) by the second of the color of

and the group of the production of the control of t

an the graph of the control of the c

Tallian and the same of the same of the same and the same of the s Beginner i Die Bereichte der Gerander beginnt der Aufgeber besteht der G Burney, the commence of the co

un estigate a proposition de la constitución de la figura de la figura de la constitución de la constitución d Anticología de la constitución de la constitución

ကြည်းသည် မြန်မာသည် ရေးမေသည် မြန်မာမည် မြန်မည်ပြုပြုနှင့် ပြုလည်းများသည်။ မြန်မာမည် မြန်မာမှ ပြုသည်။ မြေ

Committee the second to the second second

The state of the s

Authorita da sample de la limitation de la companie de la companie de la companie de la companie de la companie

ారం ప్రామెక్టులు ఉంది. కామార్క్ మార్క్ స్టామ్లు ముందు మందు మార్క్ మార్క్ మార్క్ మార్క్ మార్క్ స్టామ్లు ఇద్దారు. మందు మందు మార్క్ స్టా కామార్క్ మార్క్ మార్

represents an adequate result for the class. I request that the protective order and/or confidentiality agreement be either vacated or modified so that class members may determine whether discovery was adequate. I also oppose the amount of attorney fees requested as being way above what might be considered reasonable especially because the red flags raised by unnecessary discovery meant only to pad Class counsel's lodestar.

Very truly yours,

Sebrina Narkin 85391 Chezem Road

Eugene, OR 97405

541-525-0292

ke7fxa1@yahoo.com

eBay ID: breenv1

cc Figari & Davenport LLP Cooley LLP